ID: 88076803

Box 15
Item 15-42.01

FINAL REPORT

ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION WITHIN THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

January 17, 2003

Prepared for:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Prepared by:

U.S. INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT RESOLUTION

ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION WITHIN THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is the nation's largest steward of public lands. Its mission "to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations" is being challenged by dramatic changes in population and settlement patterns (particularly in the Western United States) as well as in the attitudes and values people place on public lands management.

Working collaboratively with a wide range of stakeholder groups has become an increasingly common feature of BLM's decision-making processes. The BLM has also recognized the importance of integrating alternative dispute resolution (ADR) into its decision-making, and has established a Natural Resources ADR (NR ADR) program.

In September, 2001, the BLM signed an interagency agreement with the U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (the U. S. Institute) "to provide assessment, mediation, consultation, training, process design, and other services as may be requested by BLM." The initial phase of the U. S. Institute/BLM interagency agreement focuses on an internal assessment of the current use of NR ADR and collaborative practices within BLM projects. During August to October, 2002, interviews were conducted with BLM staff who are actively engaged in NR ADR-related initiatives. The primary objectives of the assessment were to:

- Provide an overview of the national understanding and application of NR ADR and collaborative practices, including an inventory of BLM projects where these approaches have been utilized.
- Develop a more thorough understanding of the perceived costs and benefits (both economic and non-economic) of applying NR ADR and collaborative practices.
- Identify constraints, needs and opportunities for enhancing the use of NR ADR practices within BLM projects.

A draft version of this report was distributed to all those interviewed during the assessment, to provide an opportunity for this group to review and comment on the draft report. Comments and changes suggested by these readers have, as appropriate, been incorporated into this final report.

Key Findings

- Interviews revealed a wide range of experience, insight, and training in NR ADR practices among BLM staff identified as key proponents and resource persons for NR ADR. Interviewees acknowledged the need for further training and capacity building in NR ADR at all levels of the agency. They also suggested that learning opportunities should be tailored to staff positions, responsibilities, and level of experience with NR ADR.

ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION WITHIN THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

- The use, definition, and distinctions among varied terms associated with NR ADR (e.g., public participation, collaboration, relationship building, partnership development, and conflict resolution) pose both conceptual and practical challenges for the BLM; however, interviewees generally supported broad application of NR ADR within project and decision-making contexts.
- Interviewees indicated that the primary obstacles to enhancing NR ADR use are internal to the BLM, and many of these are more perceived than real. Most commonly cited as barriers to NR ADR use: BLM's "corporate culture," and the attitudes, traditions, and norms that relate to agency-based decision making.
- NR ADR is generally viewed as being poorly integrated in national BLM resource program guidance.
- There is limited systematic documentation and analysis of NR ADR work within the BLM. Interviewees acknowledged limited experience with, and need for the development of an effective monitoring and evaluation system. However, many recognized the daunting challenges of creating an effective evaluation effort for ADR: a) multiple objectives for monitoring and evaluation, b) lack of clarity on basic terms and program approaches, c) the problems of comparison among varied contexts, d) extended time scale for evaluation, e) limited internal capacity and time constraints, and f) the high cost of evaluation.
- The most consistently expressed needs for enhancing NR ADR use within the BLM were commitment from BLM leadership, training and capacity building, and an effective monitoring, evaluation and documentation system.

Key Recommendations/Options

- In the short term, there is strong interest in identifying, supporting, and highlighting on-the-ground projects in which NR ADR is incorporated as a principle element of program strategy. These projects can become the foundation for further development of the NR ADR program within the BLM, and they can provide a learning laboratory for BLM staff at all levels. An inventory and selection process can be outlined to identify projects of highest potential for learning; funding and leadership support should be secured to see that these efforts receive adequate support and are carefully monitored.
- The BLM should consider supporting a variety of opportunities to strengthen capacity for NR ADR use with staff at all levels within the agency. The identification of "core competencies" and support for a variety of training and learning events are critical elements in building professionalism in NR ADR practice within the agency.
- There is a perceived need for BLM to clarify its use of terminology and formulate a typology of contexts and strategies for NR ADR and collaborative approaches. However, there are diverse opinions among BLM staff whether these approaches should be combined as one general and embracing strategy, or viewed as separate and distinct strategies and programs.

- An important way of adding identity and clarification to NR ADR work is to more clearly define roles and responsibilities for the State ADR Advisors and to formally define, or integrate, these duties into their current position descriptions and/or performance standards. Establishing the State ADR Advisors as a recognized network, both within their states and with each other, is viewed as another key element of this strategy.

- The BLM should also consider elevating the NR ADR program in the Washington office at an organizational level high enough to ensure direct upper management reporting and support. The placement of the NR ADR program within the BLM should provide sufficient access and visibility to BLM's stakeholders to convey the importance placed on NR ADR and collaborative action.

- There is a recognized need for the BLM to develop clear and consistent national policy guidance that identifies strategies and defines the philosophy, structure, orientation, and strategic importance of NR ADR within the agency. This guidance, to be effective, should be articulated and supported at the highest levels of the BLM and the Department of Interior, and disseminated widely and aggressively in order to provide direction and support for initiative throughout the agency.

- The BLM should consider developing a thoughtful and systematic approach to monitoring and evaluating NR ADR activities, and find effective ways of linking this effort to other relevant agency initiatives related to documentation, sharing, learning, and broader policy and institutional development.

- BLM can also manifest its commitment to NR ADR in a variety of important ways:
    1) Recognition of NR ADR as a distinct program
    2) Procedural guidance on the use of NR ADR in varied project settings
    3) Setting goals, standards, and core competencies for the NR ADR program
    4) Integrating NR ADR into existing policies and programs
    5) Financial support through a variety of funding mechanisms
    6) Support, recognition, and incentives for innovative use of NR ADR
    7) Creating a network of identified staff and resources on NR ADR
    8) Building formal partnerships with other agencies and organizations with experience and resources

This assessment report is provided to the BLM Dispute Resolution Manager to distribute as appropriate within the BLM and the Department of Interior. The report may also be shared with BLM partners and other interested parties.

It is anticipated that this assessment report will also provide guidance for additional support services envisioned under the interagency agreement between the U. S. Institute and the BLM.

ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION WITHIN THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

I) Background

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is the largest land manager in the United States, having jurisdiction over 264 million acres of surface land (approximately 1/8 of the nation's total land area), as well as more than 300 million acres of subsurface mineral resources. In pursuing its mission "to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations" the BLM faces a plethora of challenges as the public lands under its supervision are buffeted by dramatic changes in population and settlement patterns (particularly in the Western United States) as well as in the attitudes and values people place on public lands management. The BLM's multiple-use mission must address a range of new, and rapidly shifting expectations, and a complicated, and growing public debate about the conservation and use of America's public lands.

Given the diverse issues and stakeholders involved in the management of these lands, the BLM has continued to explore new ways to engage the public in decision making over the lands under its jurisdiction. Collaboration with States, Tribes, local communities, and a wide range of stakeholder groups has become an increasingly common feature of BLM's decision-making processes. These new relationships and strategies for encouraging public participation are particularly critical considering the large number of Resource Management Plan (RMP) revisions mandated by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (1976) and scheduled over the coming two years, as well as the widespread impacts from the 2002 fire season and an evolving national debate over energy policy.

Collaborative approaches to public lands management have also assumed increasing importance given the significant number of protests, appeals, and lawsuits directed at BLM decisions. The BLM has recognized the importance of integrating alternative dispute resolution (ADR) approaches into decision making by establishing a Natural Resources ADR program.

Collectively, these approaches are fundamental elements of the Department of Interior's growing commitment to a management philosophy predicated on "the four C's: consultation, cooperation, and communication, in the service of conservation." However, defining these approaches, operationalizing them in the wide array of project contexts, and coordinating, facilitating, and monitoring these more participatory decision-making processes, represent new, and largely uncharted territory for the BLM.

In September, 2001, the Bureau of Land Management signed an interagency agreement with the U. S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (the U. S. Institute) "to provide assessment, mediation, consultation, training, process design, and other services as may be requested by BLM." This agreement recognized the BLM's interest in enhancing the use of Natural Resources Alternative Dispute Resolution (NR ADR), environmental conflict resolution (ECR), and collaborative conflict management (CCM) practices. The partnership with the US Institute offers an important opportunity to evaluate past and current use of NR ADR and collaborative approaches, draw significant lessons from this experience, and determine appropriate means for further developing these approaches within the BLM.

II) Assessment of Natural Resources Alternative Resources Alternative Dispute Resolution (NR ADR)

This initial phase of the U. S. Institute/BLM interagency agreement focuses on an assessment of the current use of NR ADR and collaborative practices within BLM projects.[1] Strong emphasis was requested for an assessment of the current level of support for NR ADR approaches, actual and potential barriers to utilizing these strategies, possible ways of monitoring and evaluating project-related activities, and needs, opportunities, and recommendations for enhancing NR ADR and collaborative practices in varied project contexts.

The primary objectives of the assessment were to:

- Provide an overview of the national understanding and application of NR ADR and collaborative practices, including an inventory of BLM projects where these approaches have been utilized.

- Develop a more thorough understanding of the perceived costs and benefits (both economic and non-economic) of applying NR ADR and collaborative practices.

- Identify constraints, needs and opportunities for enhancing the use of NR ADR practices within BLM projects.

A situation assessment is a helpful tool that is often used to provide baseline information, common understanding, and initial framing of complex issues. A systematic and thoughtful assessment can offer good diagnostic information that captures a broad base of perspectives and guides decision-making; it can also serve as an excellent catalyst for stimulating reflection and dialogue. However, most assessments, this one included, are largely qualitative, un-scientific, and preliminary in nature. They offer a general representation, not a comprehensive analysis, of stakeholder perspectives, and again are most useful in generating a candid and objective framing of issues for discussion. It is important that the reader keep this in mind while reading through this report.

This assessment involved interviews with BLM staff who are actively engaged in NR ADR-related initiatives. The national Bureau Dispute Resolution Manager, Paul Politzer, worked with the US Institute to identify a list of proposed interviewees and a set of interview questions exploring several principle issues:

A. General background information, including personal history, general views about NR ADR, direct project or case experience, and available documentation.

B. Suitability of NR ADR: general perspectives, situations most/least conducive to applying NR ADR approaches, pre-conditions for success, and alternative approaches.

[1] As discussed in this report, within the BLM there is wide-ranging, somewhat controversial, and generally inconsistent use of terminology related to alternative dispute resolution or collaborative approaches to natural resource management decision making. For convenience and brevity, and to honor conventions currently used by the Bureau Dispute Resolution Program, this report generally uses the term Natural Resources Alternative Dispute Resolution (NR ADR) to encompass the varied practices of involving the public in decision-making processes.

C. Barriers to the use of ADR: internal/external, challenges and constraints, expectations from leadership.

D. Assessing impacts: perceived impacts, criteria for evaluation, evaluation mechanisms.

E. Opportunities, needs, and recommendations for enhancing NR ADR use within the BLM.

(The list of suggested questions used during the interviews is included in Appendix 1).

This initial assessment was designed to limit the number of interviewees to an internal BLM audience. Interviews were conducted during August to October, 2002 with 19 individuals representing State ADR Advisors, representatives of key national centers (the National Training Center and the National Fire Center), and various Washington office staff (the list of interviewees is included in Appendix 2). The interviews were conducted confidentially; although all comments shared with the interviewer were recorded and are integrated into this report, no statement is attributed to a specific individual.

Many of the interviews, and much of the analysis for the assessment, were completed in preparation for a national meeting on NR ADR in the BLM, convened in Washington DC on September 17 – 20, 2002. Preliminary findings were shared (in abbreviated form) with BLM participants as part of their internal program review and planning process. These preliminary findings were tabulated and presented as well in worksheets that were distributed to participants for additional discussion and validation. The information provided by workshop participants has also been incorporated into the analysis below.

Larry Fisher, the U.S. Institute's Senior Program Manager for Public Lands and Natural Resources Management, conducted the interviews, met with BLM staff in Washington DC, and is the principal author of this report.

A draft version of this report was distributed to those interviewed for the assessment, in order to offer an initial opportunity for this group to comment on and assist with editing of the draft. Comments and changes suggested by these readers have, as appropriate, been incorporated into this final report.

The final assessment report is being provided to the BLM Dispute Resolution Manager distribute as appropriate within the BLM and the Department of Interior; the report may also be shared with BLM partners and other interested parties. It is anticipated that the findings and recommendations from this analysis will form the basis for further defining the range of activities for the BLM's NR ADR program. The report will also provide guidance for additional support services envisioned under the interagency agreement between the U. S. Institute and the BLM.

III) Results and Findings

A) Background and experience with NR ADR

Interviews revealed a wide range of personal background, experience, and training in alternative dispute resolution and in collaborative processes. Several of those interviewed have been involved with NR ADR approaches for more than a decade. Among the interviewees are active, certified mediators, some with a strong natural science background and others with considerable legal

education and law or policy experience. At the same time, many of those interviewed acknowledged that they had had no formal NR ADR training or direct exposure to project-related management experience. The most common form of exposure was through reading of relevant literature (conceptual materials as well as project reports), followed by personal experience and attendance at conferences, workshops, and training events. Few of the interviewees had received any formal academic training on these subjects, and even fewer had participated directly, at least in a leadership role, in projects where NR ADR approaches had been used in a prominent way.

The diversity of experience and formal training is thus the most conspicuous feature of the group's level of background and training in NR ADR. Several interviewees spoke of the importance of their own inherent personal characteristics and instincts in shaping their views and involvement in NR ADR; they mentioned very specific events, even "epiphanies," that had revealed to them the power and application of ADR to public lands decision-making processes. Others acknowledged a general lack of project exposure or formal training and commented on the importance of skills training if they are to play an effective role in promoting NR ADR approaches.

In reviewing individual responses among interviewees, it is also apparent, in general, that the degree of interest, engagement, and level of exposure to NR ADR is higher among State ADR Advisors than it is among Washington office and Center staff. While there are notable exceptions, responses suggest that State ADR Advisors have had more formal training, project exposure, participation in workshops and conferences, and exposure to the literature. Several ADR Advisors have undertaken graduate training in ADR or related topics, a few are responsible for projects where NR ADR is consciously being applied, and several regularly attend professional conferences on these subjects. However, this is far from universal – other ADR Advisors talked openly of their limited experience and need for more formal training and other learning opportunities.

Participants were asked how they would **best** learn about NR ADR. Responses suggest that both project exposure and formal training courses are viewed as most important, while conferences and workshops, academic training, reading and exposure to literature, and in-service training events, were regarded as of lesser priority.

Interviewees were also asked to comment on their most important learning goals for NR ADR-related programs. The following priorities were indicated (in ranked order of priority):

- Interest-based negotiation
- general courses on ADR and collaborative processes
- facilitation and communication skills
- mediation
- graduate degree or certification training.

Definition of NR ADR

Many interviewees commented on the diverse vocabulary and understandings associated with the practice of NR ADR. A wide range of terms, including alternative dispute resolution, environmental conflict resolution, environmental mediation, collaboration, collaborative conflict management, collaborative action, and collaborative problem-solving, and a variety of more informal terms, such as early intervention, relationship building, public participation, "schmoozing," or even "speakin' buckaroo" were used to describe a general approach to encouraging greater public participation in

decision-making processes. While some interviewees dismissed this variation in the use of terms as natural and actually quite healthy (pointing out the broad diversity and set of approaches that define this field), others expressed concern over the misunderstandings that have arisen, the challenge of identifying and highlighting this work, and the difficulty of tracking, evaluating, and contrasting this work with other, more conventional decision-making approaches. General distinctions were made between upstream (pro-active/preventive approaches, such as those used in broad-based planning processes) and downstream (reactive/crisis management, e.g., for protests and appeals) responses, and interviewees often pointed out differences between collaborative approaches and ADR or conflict resolution. These distinctions have programmatic and training implications that were mentioned in several of the interviews.

When asked to characterize the general attitude toward the use of NR ADR practices within the BLM, interviewees most often used the words "ad hoc," or "opportunistic" to describe their colleagues' level of interest. Many of those interviewed reflected the view that BLM staff are generally supportive of these approaches (or at the least, not antagonistic), but expressed concern for the lack of clear policy guidance. Several interviewees commented on the need for greater leadership and vision from Washington, suggesting that the Department of Interior's "Four C's" is largely viewed as rhetorical, with limited operational emphasis in the field. Some interviewees did raise concerns over the significant reliance on top-down, agency-based decision-making, and commented on the resistance they had encountered in certain circumstances. Several described the general attitude within the BLM as "complicated," "contradictory," or "schizophrenic" about NR ADR – on the one hand generally encouraging collaborative and ADR approaches, on the other restricting funding, shortening timeframes for decision processes, allowing national politics to dictate local decisions, and interfering in specific decision actions or micro-managing procedures (e.g., Notices of Intent, press releases).

Many of the interviewees did point to the important signals being sent by the elevation of the NR ADR program in the BLM Washington Office, and the establishment of the DOI's Office on Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution (CADR). Some cited recent and pending leadership changes as indication of renewed commitment to NR ADR approaches; many of those interviewed prior to the National Workshop on NR ADR pointed to this meeting as an important sign of renewed commitment, and a significant opportunity to collectively define a new direction and sense of purpose for NR ADR approaches. Several interviewees viewed these actions as inter-related and a clear indication of a reinvigorated commitment to NR ADR approaches within the BLM.

Case/project experience

Interviewees mentioned a variety of specific projects where a NR ADR approach had been utilized. Cases included specific management decisions, such as oil and gas leasing, lighthouse management, grazing, and land acquisition, as well as broader consultation and planning processes such as land use planning (e.g., Resource Management Plans and Plan Amendments), wildlife management, or tribal consultation. Several of those interviewed also discussed the use of ADR within internal BLM management or inter-agency collaborative processes, some of which are regional or national in scope.

A list of projects identified by interviewees as situations in which NR ADR was used as a prominent element of the approach is presented in Appendix 3. This list is certainly preliminary, and its accuracy and degree of inclusiveness was somewhat constrained by the limitations of the interviewing process.

It is important to note, however, that several of those interviewed could not identify a specific project where NR ADR had been an explicit element of the decision-making process. Many acknowledged that their current job descriptions preclude active field-level involvement, and they have limited access to reports or forums where these cases and approaches are discussed. Some interviewees indicated that the extent of their exposure to NR ADR was through internal management actions and workplace-related ADR.

Documentation

Most interviewees were generally unaware of any active project or program documentation on NR ADR within the BLM. Although some mentioned individual conflict assessment reports, case studies, briefing papers, or project reports, there was a general acknowledgement that the BLM has no current system in place for tracking cases, documenting their impacts, analyzing lessons learned, or even sharing these experiences in a systematic way. This was seen by many as a critical need for future development of the NR ADR program within BLM.

The most frequently mentioned documentation resources were the NR ADR web site (http://www.blm.gov/nradr/, last updated 2/19/00), and the Natural Resources ADR Strategic Plan and Tool Kit (1997), compiled with the assistance of several of the current State ADR Advisors, Washington office, and Center staff interviewed for this assessment. Both of these resources are viewed as important by those who assisted in their development; however the web site and tool kit were not known to all interviewees, and even for those who regularly use these resources, they were generally described as somewhat outdated, and not well utilized within the BLM.

While interviewees generally agreed on the importance of documentation of NR ADR experience, many pointed to the significant challenges of systematically documenting this work. The most commonly cited constraint was the fact that NR ADR is seen as "collateral" duty, i.e., not part of formal job descriptions and not recognized as a high priority. In addition, interviewees commented on the lack of a regular reporting mechanism or system, the fact that there are no obvious rewards for taking the time to write up project experience, and the operational concern that NR ADR is not recognized as a discrete program. Some interviewees also spoke of the challenge of writing about NR ADR given the serious sensitivities within these projects (e.g., concerns over confidentiality).

B) Suitability of NR ADR

Most interviewees pointed to broad general opportunities for utilizing NR ADR approaches within BLM. They cited its applications in a variety of contexts, both for pro-active, early intervention efforts (i.e., *"…. anytime we're asking the public for input"*) as well as for situations where conflicts has already surfaced (e.g., appeals). Many offered sweeping comments echoing the statement made by one interviewee: *"I wouldn't preclude the use of collaboration in any context"*. Most commonly cited as situations where NR ADR would be most appropriate: 1) planning and land use decisions, 2) NEPA actions (EAs, EISs), and 3) specific proposals for land management actions (timber sales, energy

projects, mining operations, grazing allotments, fire suppression, actions involving threatened and endangered species, and the BLM's Wild Horse and Burro program). ADR approaches were also viewed as appropriate in decision actions where protests, appeals, or litigation was underway or anticipated.

However, some interviewees remain skeptical of the unilateral application of NR ADR approaches. Some of the situations mentioned by these individuals as being inappropriate for the use of NR ADR include: 1) land appraisals (although one interviewee did share experience with a land appraisal case where ADR was used effectively), 2) very localized actions where public interest is not great (e.g., simple maintenance activities), 3) condemnation actions, and 4) where there is an obvious, though unstated agenda by extremists to stop the action at all costs. Concerns were also expressed about how FACA (the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972), or its interpretation within the BLM, might affect managers' sense of opportunities for using NR ADR approaches.

A good deal of discussion revolved around the particular conditions, or pre-conditions, associated with successful application of NR ADR. Knowledge of these conditions can be helpful to BLM managers both in assessing the opportunity for utilizing NR ADR approaches, as well as in evaluating the effectiveness of these approaches. The pre-conditions viewed as most critical to NR ADR success include (presented in order of priority):

1) Willingness of parties to participate
2) Agency commitment to the process
3) Trust among the parties
4) Presence of a qualified neutral
5) Clarity on agency sideboards (political, legal, technical)
6) Overlapping interests among the parties
7) Clarity about the decision process
8) Availability of resources (time, funding)

Other conditions cited in the interviews, and during the Washington meeting (in order of frequency of response): long term involvement, available expertise, identified representatives, decision space, opportunity for trade-offs, staff incentives, identification of all parties, and the involvement of skilled/experienced staff.

C) Barriers to NR ADR Use

Interviewees raised a number of concerns about the constraints and challenges of enhancing NR ADR use within the BLM. Most commonly cited as constraints were those internal to the BLM, primarily the attitudes, traditions, and the "corporate culture" of the agency – that the agency must be in control of decision-making, that public participation is seen as an uncertain, and "messy" proposition, and the general fear of risk-taking. Many emphasized, however, that these barriers are more perceived than real – that there are no defined structural or procedural constraints within the BLM to undertake NR ADR approaches. Many also noted that limited experience or exposure to successful NR ADR projects reinforces the reticence and fear of risk-taking associated with changing entrenched agency approaches to decision making.

Also frequently mentioned as an internal barrier to NR ADR was access to resources, particularly funding. Interviewees commented regularly about the lack of available (or designated) funding to implement NR ADR approaches, specifically alluding to the fact that NR ADR is not a defined program, and thus has no identify or program code for allocated or line-item funding. On the other hand, consistent with comments shared about attitudes and traditions, several interviewees felt that the issue of funding has also been used as an excuse to justify more conventional approaches. These individuals viewed funding decisions as highly discretionary – that managers do in fact have the authority to allocate their budgets in ways that encourage more collaborative approaches.

Time was also identified as a critical constraint to implementing NR ADR approaches. Several interviewees discussed scheduling restrictions for planning cycles and NEPA-related actions, such as Resource Management Plan (RMP) revisions. In this context, BLM managers are often given mixed messages from the Washington or State office – e.g., *"Be collaborative, but do it within 16 months!"* These interviewees feel that NR ADR does require a longer initial commitment to building relationships and community capacity, and it also requires greater flexibility and responsiveness than is offered under current scheduling deadlines and targets.

Several other internal barriers were identified by interviewees (in order of frequency of response): 1) fear of FACA restrictions, 2) cooptation of NR ADR terms (e.g., collaboration) and the multiplicity of methods and approaches associated with these terms, 3) the absence of mechanisms for rewarding NR ADR work, 4) focus on other management responsibilities (i.e., NR ADR is seen as collateral duty), and 5) mixed commitment in field offices.

As mentioned above, interviewees' primary focus during the discussion about barriers to applying NR ADR in BLM programs were internal constraints within the agency. However, when prompted on additional, and more external barriers to implementing NR ADR, interviewees spoke about the lack of trust or suspicion on the part of many stakeholders, the presence of extremist elements with other agendas, and the fact that parties (both internal and external) are not always willing to participate in collaborative processes. Finally, interviewees mentioned long-standing, deep-seated issues, such as State's rights or off-road vehicle use, as additional potential barriers to NR ADR.

D) Assessing the impact of NR ADR

Challenges in developing an effective NR ADR monitoring system

All interviewees acknowledged concerns over the limited attention given to documenting, tracking, monitoring, or evaluating NR ADR use within the BLM. Many shared serious concerns about the lack of commitment to systematic monitoring and evaluation; however, a variety of perspectives was shared over appropriate methods and objectives for undertaking evaluation. Some interviewees highlighted the need for project tracking to report project successes, contrast NR ADR with other forms of agency decision-making, and demonstrate its impacts – both tangible and intangible. Others spoke of the need for monitoring as a key element of accountability – particularly financial – so that BLM as an agency can monitor the costs of NR ADR and draw conclusions about its cost-effectiveness. Still others viewed monitoring and evaluation primarily as a learning tool, an opportunity to analyze, reflect upon, and draw important lessons from innovative approaches to public involvement and decision making.

Although some referred to specific reports or case studies of projects where NR ADR approaches have been applied, much of this analysis was regarded as opportunistic, varied (in terms of content and quality), more promotional than analytical, and less than systematic. However, when asked to recommend specific tools, methods, or approaches to develop a monitoring and evaluation effort for NR ADR, many interviewees were at a loss to offer specific suggestions. A number of considerations were cited as challenges to effective monitoring of NR ADR projects.

The most commonly raised difficulty in monitoring NR ADR work was the problem associated with blurred or inexact definitions of terms and approaches. Several interviewees spoke of the strong overlap between pro-active, collaborative approaches and more downstream responses to protests, appeals, and litigation. In this view, it is difficult to separate general preventive approaches from more project- or decision-specific actions in which NR ADR approaches have been utilized.

Several interviewees commented on the methodological challenges of making comparisons among what may be very similar types of cases in very dissimilar contexts – e.g., the difficulty of contrasting an RMP revision in different states. Interviewees also spoke of the difficulty of evaluating impacts given the long-term nature of NR ADR approaches, and the extended time-scale needed to truly assess the benefits (or disadvantages) of these approaches. Other challenges identified by interviewees: the significant costs of conducting program evaluation, limited capacity, time and/or resources for evaluation within BLM, the trade-offs between quantitative and qualitative approaches to evaluation, and the need for evaluating projects on both process (e.g., stakeholder satisfaction) and substantive (e.g., improvements to the resource) outcomes.

Several interviewees did, however, suggest analogues for establishing a monitoring and evaluation system for NR ADR. Cited as good examples that would provide guidance for BLM's NR ADR program: BLM's own Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) tracking system for workplace ADR, the U. S. Institute's program evaluation effort for environmental conflict resolution projects, and the Consensus Building Institute's action-oriented research project on designing public participation and dispute resolution systems for federal land managers.

Tools and criteria for evaluating NR ADR

Given the wide diversity of viewpoints on the objectives of evaluation, and the significant challenges identified by interviewees, it is not surprising that they suggested a long, diverse list of proposed criteria and indicators for evaluating NR ADR activities. The list can be clustered by themes into the following categories (again, presented in order of frequency of response):

1) **Better management decisions**: The most commonly cited means of evaluating NR ADR approaches was simply stated: *"Whether or not we reach an agreement."* Many interviewees offered the view that the real proof of the effectiveness of NR ADR approaches would be seen in the improved quality, and enhanced durability, of agreements reached. Stated in another way, many suggested that *"reduction in appeals and litigation"* would be another important, and eminently measurable outcome of the use of NR ADR – i.e., that fewer appeals would be a direct result of the improved decisions reached through more active public involvement. Many interviewees acknowledged the difficulty in determining what constitutes a "better agreement" and suggested that reduced appeals may, in fact, be easier to monitor.

2) **Improved public perception of BLM**: Many interviewees suggested that public perception and stakeholder satisfaction were important indicators for evaluating NR ADR projects, and that these indicators were readily conducive to monitoring and evaluating projects over time. Some suggested public surveys as an effective means for monitoring attitudes about the BLM; others recommended simple, anecdotal information, such as press coverage, attendance at public meetings, or quality of the dialogue or relationships with key stakeholder groups.

3) **Learning, capacity building, and institutional change:** Several interviewees focused their comments on the learning process aspects of evaluation; in short, that "lessons learned" was a more appropriate goal of evaluation than the conventional *"How many widgets have we produced?"* or *"How much money have we saved?"* Several interviewees suggested that regular convening, reflection, and analysis of NR ADR projects would be more important strategically, and that the real challenge of evaluation is finding means for institutionalizing this learning within the BLM and using the lessons gained from this work to inform project management, program, and policy decisions.

4) **Improved resource conditions:** Some interviewees emphasized that the main objective of all decision processes is to improve the condition of the resource, and that this should be one of the principal criteria, if not the primary indicator, for any evaluation effort. At the same time, several of these individuals quickly acknowledged the difficulties of monitoring ecological change over time, and pointed to emerging lessons for ecosystem monitoring that are only just beginning to be incorporated into BLM management practices.

5) **Meeting management objectives:** Defined management objectives, such as projected time frames and budgets, were another commonly cited set of criteria. Several interviewees commented that within the BLM these elements are generally viewed by senior officials as important indicators of effective management, and thus should be included in any monitoring and evaluation system.

6) **Reduced cost of decisions:** Several interviewees felt that cost-effectiveness was of critical importance in evaluating NR ADR work and comparing it to other approaches. These individuals emphasized that financial accountability is the key consideration for upper management and political leaders, and BLM's NR ADR program would ultimately be judged on whether it could prove greater impact for less funding. At the same time, these individuals did acknowledge the practical difficulties in evaluating the concept of "cost-effectiveness." Most of these difficulties – extended time scales, difficulty of comparing projects, the high initial investment involved in NR ADR approaches, and the many general difficulties associated with financial accounting procedures – have been noted in the discussion above on challenges associated with monitoring NR ADR.

E) Opportunities, needs, and recommendations

Needs for enhancing NR ADR

The most consistently expressed needs for enhancing or expanding NR ADR use within the BLM were commitment from BLM leadership (Washington, State, and Field Office levels), and training and capacity building. Many cited the need for consistent policy guidance and a strong indication from BLM leadership that NR ADR *"is the way we do business"* – that it is not only acceptable, but a standard feature of BLM management practice. Several mentioned plans for elevating the Dispute Resolution Program within the Bureau's Washington Office, to enhance its visibility and commitment to these processes and send a clear message to stakeholders. Many interviewees cited numerous ways that leadership could manifest this commitment, including (listed in order of perceived priority):

1) identification and support for selected NR ADR projects
2) recognition of NR ADR as a distinct program
3) procedural guidance
4) elevating the NR ADR program in the Washington office's organizational structure
5) setting goals and standards for the NR ADR program
6) integration of NR ADR into the planning process and guidelines
7) funding, and
8) support, incentives, recognition, and tolerance for innovators.

Training and capacity building have been addressed elsewhere in this report. While there are varied perspectives on the type of training and learning models to use (and how these should be offered for different staffing levels and responsibilities) there is a strong and consistent sense of the need for training at all levels within BLM. Some interviewees identified training needs in broad educational and marketing terms – both for BLM staff, as well as for external partners and the public (e.g., for county commissioners). Many spoke in very specific terms about training topics, courses, peer mentoring, exposure field trips, certification courses, or formal academic training.

Finally, interviewees pointed to the need for a systematic monitoring and evaluation system. Comments on this topic were quite varied, however, and again echo impressions shared above in regard to evaluation of NR ADR projects. While some clearly feel that a standard, quantitative tool for tracking and comparing projects (particularly the costs and benefits of these projects) is essential, others talked more of the need for reflective analysis and the development of an institutional memory within the BLM for lessons learned. Those who expressed this latter viewpoint suggested increased effort at creating a "learning organization" approach within the Bureau.

Suggestions for specific activities or policies

When asked for specific recommendations on actions to enhance the use of NR ADR within BLM, interviewees' strongest and most consistent response was "training." Many suggested providing formal training courses within the BLM and/or making formal training courses more accessible for BLM staff (including incentives and funding for participating in training events). Many had very specific requests for particular training activities (see Section A); others recommended provision of NR ADR training to all senior managers and decision-makers within the agency.

In this context, the second most common recommendation was for revised recruitment and appointment policies, to ensure that senior managers enter their positions with both the personality characteristics and the appropriate skills to prepare them to effectively utilize NR ADR practices. State Directors and Field Managers, for example, could be given greater exposure to NR ADR and collaborative approaches and offered additional training to further enhance these skills. Some recommended that this training should be considered an essential element of all senior managers' professional development.

Several interviewees recommended stronger investment (including funding) in NR ADR projects, to ensure that the BLM demonstrates success in these approaches. Greater project focus would help BLM highlight success and help the agency learn from both successes and failures associated with these projects. These individuals also felt that greater project-focused investment would send a strong message throughout the agency about the priority placed on the use of NR ADR approaches.

The general issue of funding was another frequent recommendation identified by interviewees. There were a variety of suggestions over the best mechanism, location, and investment for this funding, but many shared the view that dedicated funding and the designation of project codes were critical needs in enhancing NR ADR use within the agency. Interviewees' recommendations about funding included a national fund managed by the Bureau Dispute Resolution Manager (possibly applied for by State ADR Advisors in a competitive way), funds made available through individual State offices, and greater allocation of funds for NR ADR within particular project budgets. Funding was requested for hiring outside mediators and facilitators, for greater efforts at convening the public and encouraging participation, and for training activities.

In addition to the recommendations above (training, recruitment, project support, and funding), interviewees also suggested: 1) refining the BLM ADR web site, 2) improved guidance on FACA, and 3) improved documentation of project experience.

IV) Conclusions and Recommendations

This assessment of Natural Resources Alternative Dispute Resolution within the BLM is one initial step in a series of conversations and internal analyses that will be occurring within the Bureau over the next several months. The NR ADR Advisors' meeting, held in Washington, D. C. on September 17 – 20, 2002, and concurrent with this assessment, was another important element of strategic planning for the BLM in developing its vision and policies for NR ADR initiatives. Two working groups were convened during the workshop (goals and standards for NR ADR policy, and strategic planning), and action planning teams were identified for post-workshop follow up: 1) training, 2) communication, 3) marketing, 4) budget strategies, 5) mission statement, 6) tracking system, 7) role of ADR Advisors, 8) evaluation, 9) tool kit review, 10) FACA, and 11) a business case study. The recommendations of these working groups will be important in defining the future strategic directions for the NR ADR effort, and it is assumed that there may be considerable overlap with the findings and recommendations presented below.[2]

[2] Notes from the workshop were recorded by the U. S. Institute and forwarded to the BLM's Dispute Resolution Manager. It is anticipated that a report of the workshop's proceedings and the recommendations of the working groups will be distributed subsequently by the BLM.

Given the limited scope of the interviews for this assessment, and the dynamic nature of the policy environment for NR ADR programs within the BLM, this report should therefore be seen as a foundational, if preliminary document describing the current status, opportunities, and needs for future development of NR ADR within BLM. In addition, it is important to recognize that this report may be outpaced by the rapidly changing program and policy context.

The primary intent of this assessment is to offer an overview of the current understanding and application of NR ADR within the BLM, formulate possible approaches to monitoring and evaluating these efforts, and identify constraints, opportunities and needs for further development of NR ADR. The following points summarize the principal findings of the assessment interviews and analysis, and offer key recommendations and/or options for possible follow up actions based on this analysis:

Experience, training, and competency

Key Findings:

- **Interviews revealed a wide range of experience, insight, and training in NR ADR practices among the BLM staff identified as this program's key proponents and resource persons**. The diversity of experience and training, although generally stronger among State ADR coordinators than Washington Office or National Center staff, however, is also highly varied within each of these groups.

- **There was universal acknowledgement of the need for further training and capacity building in NR ADR at all levels of the agency**.

- **Interviews suggested that learning opportunities must be designed with particular attention to staff positions, responsibilities, and level of experience with NR ADR**. A mixture of formal training, project exposure, and sharing/mentoring opportunities should be considered in defining an agency-wide approach to NR ADR capacity building.

Recommendations/Options:

1) **Identification of "core competencies" for NR ADR practice**: The BLM can work to develop objectives, or standards, that are adapted to fit the varied roles of NR ADR leaders and proponents within the agency. The network of State ADR Advisors is an important resource in helping define a set of core competencies, initially for themselves, and subsequently for State- and Field-level managers.

2) **Support for learning opportunities**: There are a range of learning opportunities, both within the BLM and beyond, that would help meet the learning objectives and core competencies identified for varied NR ADR support staff. Learning opportunities could include both formal (and in some cases, academic) training events as well as mechanisms for ongoing exposure, exchange, reflection and analysis of NR ADR experience. BLM support for in-service and other learning opportunities could include:

    - support for selected projects that become learning laboratories and reference points for staff and for BLM partners

- development of core training events on NR ADR that can be offered through the National Training Center or other venues.
- identification and support for staff participation in periodic training events offered by other federal agencies, universities, or non-profit agencies.
- national workshops and training events sponsored by the BLM and/or DOI.
- regular (and possibly rotating) regional workshops, possibly convened and coordinated by the ADR State Coordinators.
- creation of regular mechanisms for mentoring, project exposure, and other forms of peer learning among BLM staff.
- funding, release time, and other incentives for BLM staff to organize learning events, and/or attend workshops, conferences, and other relevant learning events.

Suitability, experience, documentation and analysis

Key Findings:

- **Interviewees generally supported broad application of NR ADR within project and decision-making contexts**, both for upstream efforts (e.g., collaborative planning) and for responses to protests, appeals, and as an alternative to litigation.

- **The use, definition, and distinctions among varied terms associated with NR ADR (e.g., public participation, collaboration, relationship building, partnership development, and conflict resolution) poses both conceptual and practical challenges for the BLM.** Conceptually, the lack of clear distinctions makes it difficult for staff to share and analyze experiences with these processes, and sometimes presents problems in working collaboratively with the public. The most obvious practical concerns include program identification, definition of job descriptions and responsibilities, funding, and monitoring and evaluating NR ADR-related activities.

- **There is limited systematic documentation of NR ADR work within the BLM**. The need for improved documentation was cited by many interviewees as a critical need for the agency – for evaluating and learning from this experience as well as in promoting it within the agency and to the general public. Several important avenues for documentation were suggested: an updated and expanded web site, updated edition of the NR ADR tool kit/resource book, case studies, briefing papers, conference presentations, and training/learning materials. A concomitant challenge, however, is for the BLM to seek opportunities to link documentation efforts to a project monitoring and evaluation system (see below).

Recommendations/ Options:

1) **Clarification of terminology and practice regarding NR ADR**: There is an obvious need for BLM to clarify its use of terminology and formulate a typology of contexts and strategies for NR ADR and collaborative approaches cited by interviewees during the assessment. The articulation of a defined program identity, along with general policy guidelines would be important initial steps in rectifying the blurred distinctions and apparent confusion over the use of terms and identification of activities related to NR ADR and other collaborative

strategies. Guidance for this clarification may be sought from the Department of Interior's Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution.

2) **Formalize the role of the State ADR Advisors:** One important way of adding identity and clarification to NR ADR work is to more clearly define roles and responsibilities for the State ADR Advisors and to formally define, or integrate, these duties into their current position descriptions and/or performance standards. Establishing the State ADR Advisors as a recognized network, both within their states and with each other, could be another key element of this strategy.

3) **Elevate the NR ADR Program**: The BLM should also consider elevating the NR ADR program in the Washington office to an organizational level high enough to ensure direct upper management reporting and support. The placement of the NR ADR program within the BLM should provide sufficient access and visibility to BLM's stakeholders to convey the importance placed on NR ADR and collaborative action.

4) **Systematic documentation:** The BLM can encourage systematic documentation of NR ADR experience, and define clear objectives for the analysis, documentation, and sharing of this experience – both within the agency and beyond. Objectives for documentation should be closely linked to monitoring and evaluation goals. Documentation of BLM experience would include varied publications (e.g., case studies, briefing papers, project assessments and evaluations), use of a variety of graphic media (presentations, films, videos), as well as expanded use of electronic media (web sites, listserves, and other web-based learning tools).

Barriers to NR ADR Use

Key findings:

- **Interviewees indicated that the primary obstacles to enhancing NR ADR use are internal to the BLM, and many of these are more perceived than real**. Most commonly cited as a barrier to NR ADR use: BLM's "corporate culture," and the attitudes, traditions, and norms that relate to agency-based decision making. Many interviewees also cited inexperience and uncertainty over collaborative processes as reasons for limited use of NR ADR.

- Funding resources, restricted time frames, and politics (e.g., top-down decision making) were also mentioned as internal barriers to implementing NR ADR.

Recommendations/ Options:

1) **Policy Guidance:** There is a recognized need for the BLM to develop clear and consistent policy guidance that defines the philosophy, structure, orientation, and strategic importance of NR ADR within the agency. This guidance, to be effective, should be articulated and supported at the highest levels of the Bureau and the Department, and disseminated widely and aggressively in order to provide direction and support for initiative throughout the agency.

2) **Incentives for NR ADR:** Incentives, both tangible and otherwise, are viewed as important to encourage NR ADR initiative throughout the agency. Support for NR ADR would include the identification of specific projects with high learning potential, and the funding and staff support for these initiatives, as well as the training, capacity building, and policy guidance recommendations mentioned above.

Assessing Impact – Strategy, Tools, and Criteria for Monitoring and Evaluation

Key Findings:

- **Interviewees acknowledged limited experience with, and obvious need for, developing an effective monitoring and evaluation system for NR ADR work within the BLM.** While all interviewees recognized the need for a strong evaluation component, few had direct experience or insight into how to develop an evaluation effort suitable for the multiple goals of the NR ADR program: tracking and monitoring (e.g., projects, funding, management objectives), evaluation (overall impact, successes and lessons learned), and general learning, capacity building, and institutional development.

- Many spoke of the daunting challenges in creating an effective evaluation effort for ADR: a) lack of clarity on basic terms and program approaches, b) the problems of comparison among varied contexts, c) extended time scale for evaluation, d) limited internal capacity and time constraints, and e) the high cost of evaluation.

Recommendation/Options:

1) **Monitoring and Evaluation of NR ADR:** There is an acknowledged need for BLM to define and institutionalize an effective tracking, monitoring, and evaluation effort for NR ADR. While limited guidance was offered by BLM staff interviewed for this assessment, several interviewees did suggest relevant analogues such as the BLM's own EEO and Workplace ADR program, the program evaluation effort of the US Institute, the Consensus Building Institute's action research project for federal land managers, and various (though largely unspecified) university or non-profit groups with significant experience in this area. BLM can work to identify internal and external resources and experiences that can inform and guide the development of an evaluation system, and define a process for developing a system that suits the needs of the NR ADR program. Here again, there may be opportunities for linking BLM's work in this area to the broader work anticipated by the Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution in the Department of Interior.

Opportunities and Needs for Enhancing NR ADR

Key findings:

- **The most consistently expressed needs for enhancing NR ADR use over time within the BLM were commitment from BLM leadership, training and capacity building, and an effective monitoring, evaluation and documentation system.** These comments have been reflected in the findings and recommendations outlined above, but bear repeating here (in

the recommendations below) for the special emphasis placed on these issues throughout the assessment process.

Recommendations/Options

9) **There is a need and opportunity for BLM to demonstrate an agency-wide commitment to NR ADR approaches.** The agency can begin by articulating broad but coherent policy guidance on NR ADR practice, but can also manifest its commitment in a variety of important ways:
   - Identification and support for NR ADR projects of high potential learning
   - Recognition of NR ADR as a distinct program
   - Procedural guidance on the application of NR ADR in varied project settings
   - Setting goals, standards, and core competencies for the NR ADR program
   - Integrating NR ADR into existing policies and programs (such as planning processes)
   - Financial support through a variety of funding mechanisms
   - Support, recognition, and incentives for innovative use of NR ADR
   - Development of a network of identified staff and resources on NR ADR
   - Building formal partnerships with other agencies and organizations with experience and resources

10) **The BLM can seek and support a variety of opportunities to strengthen capacity for NR ADR use with staff at all levels within the organization.** The identification of "core competencies" and support for a variety of training and learning events are critical elements in building professionalism in NR ADR practice within the agency.

11) **BLM should consider developing a thoughtful and systematic approach to monitoring and evaluation of NR ADR activities**, and find effective ways of linking this effort to other relevant agency initiatives related to documentation, sharing, learning, and broader policy and institutional development.

APPENDIX 1: SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS: BLM NATIONAL SITUATION ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (NR ADR), ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT (ECR) AND COLLABORATIVE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT (CCM) PROCESSES

INTRO/BACKGROUND

1) Can you tell me a little bit about your own background, training, experience, and involvement in ECR/NR ADR/CCM processes? What is your title or position, and how would you describe your role in these activities?

2) How would you define or characterize ECR/NR ADR/CCM practices within the BLM? ?

3) Can you identify specific projects where ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches have been utilized in your state over the past 5 years? Please try to identify the number and type/s of cases where ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches have been used. In which of these cases did you use the services of a 3rd party facilitator? A contracted public involvement specialist?

4) What kind of documentation – reports, case studies, cost estimates, etc. – exists that describes the use of ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches in specific programs in your state?

SUITABILITY OF ECR/NR ADR/CCM APPROACHES

5) How do you feel about the future for ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches in BLM decision-making? How do your colleagues generally feel about ECR/ADR/CCM?

6) What situations (programs, contexts, decision processes) do you feel are most conducive to using ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches within BLM projects? Which situations do you feel would be inappropriate for using these approaches?

7) Are there particular conditions or pre-conditions that you associate with success or failure in using ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches?

8) What are other approaches or techniques can and have been used in your state to resolve disputes and reach sound and durable decisions?

BARRIERS TO THE USE OF ECR/NR ADR/CCM APPROACHES

9) Are there particular internal BLM barriers or constraints to utilizing ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches? What about external barriers to engaging stakeholders? What are some of the ways to address or mitigate these challenges?

10) What kinds of challenges have you experienced, observed, or anticipate with the use of ECR/NR ADR/CCM processes?

11) What expectations have been communicated by BLM leadership regarding the use of ECR/NR ADR/CCM processes? What resources or incentives have been provided? Have these resources been adequate? What additional resources are needed?

ASSESSING IMPACTS

12) What ECR/NR ADR/CCM successes have you participated in or are aware of? What elements of these projects contributed to or defined their success?

13) What have been the perceived and/or demonstrated impacts (or benefits) of the use of ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches in these projects? What attempts at evaluation have been used in assessing these impacts?

14) What evaluation criteria or tools would be most effective in assessing the impact of ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches?

15) How would you describe and/or assess the short- and long-term costs (both economic and non-economic) of using ECR/NR ADR/CCM approaches versus other decision-making approaches?

16) How would you characterize the short-term gains and longer-term contributions of ECR/NR ADR/CCM processes to resource planning and environmental decision-making?

OPPORTUNITIES, NEEDS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

17) What do you feel are the most important needs for enhancing the appropriate use of ECR/NR ADR/CCM practices within the BLM?

18) What suggestions would you have for specific activities or policies that would help strengthen BLM's capacity for effectively utilizing ECR/NR ADR/CCM practices?

19) What do you feel is the most appropriate role you can play in applying ECR/NR ADR/CCM practices in your state and in promoting these approaches within BLM? What are your own interests or aspirations in developing your role?

20) Are there other points you would like to share about the application, evaluation, or recommendations for enhancing the use of ECR/NR ADR/CCM practices?

21) Do you have any questions related to this assessment or to the BLM's effort to strengthen the use of these practices?

22) Who are other key leaders or resource persons that would be worth talking to about these issues - within BLM? outside BLM?

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Taylor Brelsford, State NR ADR Advisor, Alaska
Paul Buff, State NR ADR Advisor, Arizona
Dave Cavanaugh, Lands, Washington Office
Sie Ling Chiang, Energy and Minerals, Washington Office
Debbie Chivers, National Fire Center
Jerry Cordova, Cultural Resources, Washington Office
Julie Decker, National Training Center
Marty Griffith, State NR ADR Advisor, Wyoming
Steve Hartmann, State NR ADR Advisor, Montana
Howard Levine, State NR ADR Advisor, Eastern States
John Martin, (Co-) State NR ADR Advisor, Idaho
A.J. Martinez, State NR ADR Advisor, Utah
Paul Politzer, Bureau Dispute Resolution Manager, Washington Office
Susie Stokke, State NR ADR Advisor, Nevada
Jay Thietten, Fire Management, Washington Office
Glenn Wallace, State NR ADR Advisor, Colorado
Tom Wawro, State NR ADR Advisor, Oregon
Rich Whitley, Associate State Director, New Mexico
Gary Wyke, (Co-) State NR ADR Advisor, Idaho

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF NR ADR CASES IDENTIFIED BY INTERVIEWEES[3]

- Cana Island Lighthouse Parking and Access (WI)
- Grand Traverse Lighthouse Management (MI)
- Northeast Ohio Oil and Gas Leasing (OH)
- Finger Lakes National Forest Oil and Gas Leasing (NY)
- Meadowood Farm Land Use Planning (VA)
- Clackamas River Basin Council Facilitation (OR)
- Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (OR)
- Klamath Basin ADR Water Adjudication (OR)
- Slimewater Facilitation Project (OR)
- Cascade Pacific RC&D Facilitation and Training Pilot (OR)
- Willamette River TMDL (OR)
- Red Hill Community-Based Land Use Planning (CO)
- Grandview Ridge RMP Amendment (CO)
- San Miguel River Watershed Management (CO)
- Owl Mountain Partnership (CO)
- Whitetail Pipestone Travel Planning (MT)
- Mountain National Guard Training Range (MT)
- Elkhorn Mountains Land Use Planning (MT)
- Dillon Resource Management Plan (MT)
- Lower Snake River District Resource Management Plans (ID)
- Drought Assessment and Mitigation (UT)
- Grand Staircase Escalante Land Use Planning (UT)
- Book Cliffs Land Use Planning (UT)
- St. George Land Acquisition (UT)
- Ely Resource Management Plans (NV)
- Carson City Resource Management Plans (NV)
- Otero Mesa Oil and Gas Leasing (NM)
- Taos Right of Way, Grazing Disputes (NM)
- Farmington Oil and Gas, Grazing Disputes (NM)
- Las Cruces Land Use Planning (NM)
- Black Mountain Land Ecosystem Management Plan (AZ)
- Las Cienegas Resource Management Planning (AZ)
- Tucson Recreational Shooting (AZ)
- Middle Gila OHV Use (AZ)
- North Slope Petroleum Reserve Leasing (AK)
- Caribou Recovery Plan (AK)
- Musk Ox Cooperative Management Plan (AK)
- N. California Thermal Energy (CA)

[3] These cases were identified in response to request for cases where NR ADR or other collaborative approaches have been utilized as a primary element of project management.

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF NEPA ADR CASES IDENTIFIED BY INTERVIEWEES[1]

- Cape Island Lighthouse Parking and Access (MI)
- Grand Traverse Lighthouse Management (MI)
- Northeast Ohio Oil and Gas Leasing (OH)
- Finger Lakes National Forest Oil and Gas Leasing (NY)
- Meadowood Farm Land Use Planning (VA)
- Clackamas River Basin Council Facilitation (OR)
- Upper Klamath Basin Working Group (OR)
- Klamath Basin ADR Water Adjudication (OR)
- Slimewater Facilitation Project (OR)
- Cascade Pacific RC&D Facilitation and Training Pilot (OR)
- Willamette River TMDL (OR)
- Red Hill Community-Based Land Use Planning (CO)
- Grandview Ridge RMP Amendment (CO)
- San Miguel River Watershed Management (CO)
- Owl Mountain Partnership (CO)
- Whitetail Pipestone Travel Planning (MT)
- Mountain National Guard Training Range (MT)
- Billings Mountain Land Use Planning (MT)
- Dillon Resource Management Plan (MT)
- Lower Snake River District Resource Management Plans (ID)
- Drought Assessment and Mitigation (UT)
- Grand Staircase Escalante Land Use Planning (UT)
- Book Cliffs Land Use Planning (UT)
- St. George Land Acquisition (UT)
- Ely Resource Management Plans (NV)
- Carson City Resource Management Plans (NV)
- Chaco Mesa Oil and Gas Leasing (NM)
- Taos Rights of Way, Grazing Disputes (NM)
- Farmington Oil and Gas, Grazing Disputes (NM)
- Las Cruces Land Use Planning (NM)
- Black Mountain Land Ecosystem Management Plan (AZ)
- Las Cienega Resource Management Planning (AZ)
- Tucson Recreational Shooting (AZ)
- Middle Gila OHV Use (AZ)
- North Slope Petroleum Reserve Leasing (AK)
- Caribou Recovery Plan (AK)
- Nuiqsut Oil Cooperative Management Plan (AK)
- N. California Thermal Energy (CA)

---

[1] These cases were identified in response to requests for cases where the NEPA or other collaborative approaches have been utilized as a primary element of project management.

- Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains RMP (CA)
- Pinedale Resource Management Planning (WY)